

From: Betty Gibson aka Lady McBetty
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:37 PM
Subject: Media Degregation

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Respectfully,

Beverly L. Gibson

Stanwood, MI 49346

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: Dorothy Lavalle
To: KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:48 PM
Subject: Media ownership - Letter to the FCC

Concerning AP article, "FCC Head Won't Delay Media Ownership Vote" by David Ho

Dear FCC Chairman Michael Powell, Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner Michael J. Copps, Commissioner Kevin J. Martin, and Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

I am extremely concerned with the consolidation of the media into a very few corporate owners. Already the promises of the 1996 changes to regulations have not materialized. There is less competition, not more. I, for example, must accept the poor programming provided by Cox Communications, the only cable company in my area - in fact, another infomercial station was added since I wrote my letters of complaint and concern. The situation for many will only worsen if there are fewer alternatives. Then I read the April 16 AP article by David Ho from which I quote:

The ownership rules include a ban on mergers between major television networks and a restriction preventing a company from owning a newspaper and a radio or television station in the same city. The rules also prohibit a company from owning TV stations that reach more than 35 percent of U.S. households. Powell repeatedly has said the rules should be changed. Two other Republicans on the five-member commission also are widely expected to seek looser regulations, an outcome sought by many large media companies who say the rules hurt business.

Critics warn that mergers resulting from looser rules could leave a few huge companies in control of what people watch, hear and read.

<http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=536&ncid=536&e=4&u=/ap/2003>

Already our media news is very poor. Only one position, the government's, is provided. I now get my news from BCC and C-Span for the most part, and I'd be poorly informed were it not for my computer. But many people get their only news from the major cable stations. Since we as citizens must be informed in order to make decisions within our democracy, this is a very sad situation for our nation. You have the responsibility to at least provide alternatives to the corporate media to which we now are subjected - at the very least by making policy that encourages a variety of news and entertainment sources. Our media now is an ocean of imbecility for the most part, and it's a shame for all segments of the population, but particularly for the children. It's little wonder our children have such poor test scores, and the general population have such poor geographic recognition. But perhaps more competition would encourage better quality productions. We, the people, own the airwaves, you administer in our names. It's my opinion that you have the responsibility to encourage broader media production and ownership, not less, for the sake of our local communities and the national welfare. We "liberals" do remain half the population and our concerns should be equally considered. Surely Republicans are also worried by a consolidation of ownership, you have that historic apprehension for good reason. Looser ownership rules we do not need, quite the opposite. We need to control the influence of the market and corporations who have an profit agenda, and little responsibility to the greater social needs of the society, it seems. Please keep to the schedule, and allow the American people to express their concerns in the period until June 2, which is their right. It's only fair, and fairness is the core of our legal system and social system.

Sincerely yours,
Dorothy Lavalle

From: rschl
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:55 PM
Subject: Media Domination

The coverage of this war is a blatant example of how the news that we are getting is controlled by a few large corporations who benefit handsomely from war. I know this because I am retired from one of them General Electric. This must stop. The worst propagandists are FOX and Clear Channel. Clear Channel controls AM radio in Cincinnati and it is often obscene both politically and sexually.

From: Marlene Jakubosky
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 2:25 PM
Subject: media monopoly

Dear Commissioner Powell,

I heard that Rupert Murdoch is thinking of buying Directv. This is the only satellite provider in my area, and I don't get local channels since I'm so far off in the boonies.

Mr. Murdoch already owns an enormous amount of newspapers. Having one person or one company own so much of the media should be illegal. Is there an anti-trust issue here? or is it fine and dandy for a billionaire to monopolize everything because the antitrust laws are written for corporations?

If there aren't any laws on the books, you should start getting some written, because I'm sick and tired of hearing virtually the same viewpoint on every channel. A person really has to search to get some alternative viewpoints, and that is bad for this country. We're supposed to live in a pluralistic society, not a monopolistic one. If Rupert takes over satellite, and C-Span goes, we've got 1984 in 2004. If you think I'm a crank, maybe you need to reread 1984, especially the part about "doublespeak, and meditate on "The lie oft repeated becomes the truth." When 50 per cent of Americans think Saddam Hussein was responsible for 9/11 and the nation gets whipped up into a frenzy to attack another country because of this, with the press doing absolutely nothing to correct this falsity, don't you think that's awfully strange?.

Or, you could be just like congress and abdicate your duties. Your choice. You have a lot of power. With power comes responsibility. What is your responsibility?

Yours truly,

MChinello@msn.com

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.

From: Anne Myrthue
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 3:04 PM
Subject: FCC measure to abolish restrictions on cross-ownership of themedia

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am writing to you because you are an immensely powerful man and because your actions will have incredible ramifications for the citizens of this country and therefore also for the rest of the world. Removing the restrictions on cross-ownership of the media is going to have enormous consequences for everybody. It will make democracy virtually impossible as the American People will be unable to hear all sides of the issues and therefore will lose the freedom to decide what is right for them. Freedom and Democracy are pillars of our society, enviable by everyone who are so unfortunate as not to enjoy them. Please, please consider what it will do to this country. Do we want our citizens to have restricted access to what goes on in our country and in the world, to be uninformed and ignorant like people in so many countries of the world.

What will it do to our children's education? A feeling of being empowered, of being able to freely make up one's own opinion about important issues and to communicate this opinion to others is an incredible driving force which leads to innovative thinking (which is what we need to stay productive and powerful as a country), well-educated workers and citizens, good leadership, and all the consequences that follow from these.

We will lose our privileged place in the world if we do not have a diverse media.

Please vote no on June 2nd.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Anne Myrthue, Ph.D
Portland, OR

From: John Craven
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 5:31 PM
Subject: media concentration

Dear Chairman Powell:

My first request is to ask that the FCC actually reduce to a significant degree the level of concentration that presently exists in the communications media. And at the very least, hold extensive hearings around the country on the matter.

Sincerely,

John Craven

From: LBoBJA@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 5:54 PM
Subject: Deregulation of Broadcasting

Hello,

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting

ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this

Thank you,
Lisa Bedinger
S. Burlington, VT

From: JANMEMA@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 8:10 PM
Subject: FCC REGULATIONS FOR CELL PHONES

MY CELL PHONE WAS LOST AND SPRINT WILL NOT GIVE ME THE TELEPHONE NUMBERS THAT WERE CALLED SINCE THE PHONE WAS LOST. I CAN GET THE NUMBERS IN A MONTH WHEN MY BILL COMES OUT, BUT BY THEN, THE PHONE WILL BE LONG GONE. IF I COULD CALL TODAY, I MIGHT BE ABLE TO GET IT BACK BY CONTACTING SOME PARENTS OF CHILDREN CALLED.

I THINK THAT, AGAIN, THERE IS MORE CONCERN FOR THE CRIMINALS THAN FOR THE VICTIMS!!!!

I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY I CANNOT GET THE NUMBERS. WHAT IS THE GREAT BIG DEAL?!!!!

I THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR KIND CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER.

{^_^}

{^_^}

From: amie_hanson@attbi.com
To: wkennard@fcc.gov
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 8:53 PM
Subject: Consolidation of Media Ownership

I live in Seattle, an area that, as diverse and lively as the music and political scenes are, has little diversity in available radio stations. Four companies own nearly 85% of the stations. I am constantly disappointed in the fact that much of the regional music has little representation on local stations. In fact, almost none except for the independent station KEXP.

Since the public owns the airwaves, it is disappointing to see that so few benefit from their use. With fewer companies owning our airwaves, fewer ideas and artists are broadcast. Generally, those which already have appeal on a national level are played ad nauseum. Fewer voices are heard and, therefore, fewer opinions. I recently thought of this when the author of the song "War" died. Regardless of someone's opinions on war (in general) or recent events, it is evident that such a song would not receive airplay today. I also wonder if Bob Dylan or other politically active musicians from the past would have the standing they do today if radio stations had the consolidated ownership they have now. Additionally, I have heard few stories covering this issue on the radio and understand that some news shows have not presented information on your review of regulations because they feel that it is not in the interest of company owners. A story which IS of interest to the public.

I think that we deserve to have a diverse media, not only radio. Without multiple voices and perspectives being provided to the public, our information becomes severely limited. Please do not relax regulations on ownership of television and radio stations.

I appreciate your time.

Sincerely,
Amie Hanson

Telephone: 206.985.0082
Address 8015 California Ave SW, Seattle WA 98136

CC: sness@fcc.gov, hfurchtg@fcc.gov, mpowell@fcc.gov, gtristan@fcc.gov

From: Sandra J Barton M D
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 9:04 PM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Sandra J. Barton M.D.

From: Gray Brooks
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 9:05 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

R. Gray Brooks

From: hussainmmarrar@hotmail.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 9:32 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

hussain marrar
1514 northbrook dr #c8
Normal, Illinois 61761

From: didier murat
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 10:25 AM
Subject: FCC regulations, public comment.

Chairman Michael K. Powell,

I urge you to hold public meetings before making any changes to the current media ownership limitations.

It is my belief that the public will be losing the diversity it needs in gathering informative news, un-homogenized points of view, if a few corporations are left to control our airwaves, and printed news.

Sincerely,

Didier Murat

1251 Greenbush road

Charlotte, VT 05445 USA

(802) 425 5083

From: Maurice Pennock
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 3:36 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation bad for democracy

From: Maurice R. Pennock Saturday, April 19, 2003

465 E. Commerce St.
Bridgeton New Jersey, 08302

Tel: (856) 451-2333
Fax: (856) 451-3507
Email: pennockm@att.net

Dear FCC Chairman,

Please stop the plans to end critical safeguards designed to help ensure diversity of media ownership.

I believe that the proposed deregulation will be bad for competition, the First Amendment and democracy.

Under the FCC plans, one company in a community will be able to own the newspaper, several TV and radio stations, the cable system, and the principal Internet access company. There will be fewer owners of networks, stations, and newspapers nationwide. I urge you to also call for public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect my community and the nation.

Television and other Media plays an important and powerful role in my community. It is the vehicle through which we obtain information to make decisions to shape our lives and our children's future. I am concerned about the spread of unfair and unbalanced news reporting and programming that some Media are presenting to the American People if deregulation proceeds.

I understand that television broadcasters in major cities across the United States began implementing the use of digital television signals on May 1, 1999. I want to know what responsibilities broadcasters will be required to assume in exchange for the free use of our airwaves. I am also requesting that the "Fairness Act" be reinstated to ensure that all sides of the issues are presented by the media so that people can make informed decisions.

The airwaves are a public trust, yet Congress has given exclusive control of those airwaves to major corporations for free. In return, broadcasters are supposed to act in the public interest; but this has never happened. Today, I see that critical journalism is being attacked as "Liberal" and "biased" and is being replaced with truly biased conservative corporate political views designed to shape the hearts and minds of the American people to suit the wishes of a few powerful men.

You have said that the citizenry's input is not required in deciding the outcome. You have stated that Instead you need to see hard facts generated by the FCC to support the current regulatory restrictions otherwise they will be abolished. Firstly, I disagree that the peoples voice need not be heard. Secondly, I would propose that by looking at the situation that arose out of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. One can clearly see the changes since radio deregulation and that they are not good for democracy. Today, the radio waves are dominated by the Right. A condition that did not exist before deregulation. Fair-minded and honest news reporting is daily attacked as liberal and left leaning when it is clearly not. To the contrary, Clear Channel and its' 1200 radio stations all preach the conservative message. Clear Channel is one of the Litigants in the current suit to deregulate the other media. The owner of Clear Channel has close ties to the President and has been a Republican Supporter for years.

It is my humble opinion that such bias, amplified through a national chain of over 1200 Clear Channel stations, has clear negative implications for a healthy democracy. The fact that Clear Channel presents

such positive images of Republican values has translated into Republican support for this new deregulation proposal that may (they hope) become the same pro Republican tool for Television, Cable and News Papers. The proposed deregulation holds the dual promise of enriching investors and owners of Media Giants and helping to preserve and extend Republican grip on power. I believe that this will have disastrous effects on our democracy. Americans must understand the true nature of what is going on here.

It is clear that the Media Giants now lobbying for this deregulation are deliberately not reporting the proceedings because they feel that doing so will not serve their interest. 72% of Americans are not even aware of the impending decision in June of this year. It is not a healthy situation for democracy when the profit motives of a corporation deny people access to accurate information. Please urge the Media to act on their long held insistence that they never allow self interest to manipulate the news.

Imagine the future. A future where the trend in Media mergers continues until there is no real diversity. A world where corporate interests shape and color the events of the day to suit their interests. A world where complicit government acts on the behalf of corporations while taking only token consideration of negative consequences that will harm the population. A world where the Media backs one party with support while allowing extremist elements to spew propaganda against all potential enemies of Republicans and corporations while billing it as "entertainment". What might Television look like in this world?

Rupert Murdoch's Right Wing Fox News Network comes to mind. The programming is clearly biased to the right and clearly and openly condemns and attacks what it perceives as the "liberals" yet it proclaims to be "Fair and Balanced". I call Fox News "Attack Style" since they attack, usually with monikers and jibes all that oppose their view/message to silence debate and justify their position. Let me state clearly that it is the unfairness of the "attack style" of reporting that is my concern and not conservative viewpoints.

In the case of Fox News I believe that the source of Fox's conservative position comes directly from Rupert Murdoch and are purely self serving to him. For example, Fox news is staunchly pro war. Is it mere coincidence that Rupert Murdoch has stated that the Iraq war is a good thing because "Oil at 20\$ a Barrel is Better than and Tax Cut"? Or is it something more sinister. (Note: I am not necessarily anti-war and do believe the Iraqis have been freed from an evil oppressor) Additionally, attack style news reporting draws viewers with its sensationalism and hence advertising dollars and Rupert Murdoch becomes wealthier. Fox News is now more popular than CNN.

An example of attack style reporting is when Fox News reporters go so far as to call other reporters who asked the President how long the Iraq war will take and how much it may cost "Anti-American". In my opinion, it is completely unfair and unbalanced to apply the negative image of a subversive individual to an American who asks questions of the President. Especially questions that are clearly not "Anti-American" but are merely intended to get information about the likely cost and duration of a war we are fighting. I have heard Fox News reporters refer to citizens protesting the war as "nit-wits". Tom Daschel for stating his disappointment at the failure of diplomacy was called a "Bad American" by Fox News. Fox aired the same statement made by Mr. Daschel for weeks while a parade of individuals were interviewed with universal condemnation of not only Mr. Daschel, but because he is their leader, all Democrats. The French, German and Russian People and Governments who opposed the war are routinely referred to as "weasels".

Such opinionated and inflammatory/defamatory language used to be relegated to clearly identified editorials where it was stated before the piece that the views and opinions of the speaker were not necessarily coincident with the views of the news station. Now, there has been a blurring of the lines where opinion and condemnation of opposing views is interjected liberally in the news and is actually the opinion of the broadcaster. I am very concerned that the American people are susceptible to the attack style that Fox News is using and am concerned that they will largely believe what they are told. What will happen to America when it is acceptable to attack those who ask questions or express disappointment by branding them "Bad Americans" on the nightly news. I am concerned additionally by the likelihood that this phenomenon will spread as more corporations losing market share to Fox will attempt to emulate their

style to maintain ratings and advertisers and as more mergers put more stations under Rupert Murdoch's control.

Free market advocates will advance the theory that whatever draws more viewers and generates more advertising dollars and benefits investors is sufficient justification for doing it but I disagree. For example, there is clearly a large movement in this country to control the violence and sexual images that we see on TV especially among conservatives. The free market view would hold that, sex and violence are good because it sells and we should actually have more of it. Yet there are few who would suggest that these images are beneficial to society. In just the same way I am concerned that the type of news broadcasting we are seeing in Fox News while benefiting the corporations that produce it is not beneficial to society.

The public deserves mandatory broadcasting obligations. I respectfully request that the FCC convene hearings to hear from those of us who are concerned. We should expect something fair, balanced and informative in return for giving away such vast public resources. We do not expect to see the political atmosphere and the hearts and minds of the nation shaped by the profit motives of big corporations.

Lastly and most importantly I note that although it is universally accepted that concentration of wealth and power have negative societal consequences. Concentration of power over the media is doubly dangerous, because it is through the media that society has the opportunity to learn of, discuss, and resolve its problems, including monopolistic business practices and self serving officials. Media Monopolies are in a position not only to manipulate and distort information in an uncontested information environment, but to attack or silence criticism.

Sincerely,

Maurice R. Pennock

From: SSM
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 4:08 PM
Subject: No on Media de-reg

Let freedom of the airwave ring true. NO on media dereg - corporate
pablum and government propaganda.

S. Morris
Oakland, CA

CC: ssmxcski@pacbell.net

From: Kathy Wilmering
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 5:37 PM
Subject: media deregulation

Mr. Powell:

Please do not support deregulation currently proposed for media entities. The current biased coverage of the Iraqi war by the giant few conglomerates we do have demonstrates why deregulation is not warranted. We cannot have freedom when news presentation is squarely in the hands of a small number of corporations with no input from other entities.

Sincerely,

Kathy Wilmering
10716 17th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98125

From: kevin@rolfes.org
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 19, 2003 6:05 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Kevin Rolfes
14006 N Green Hills Loop
Austin, Texas 78737

From: lila berman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:42 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Re the upcoming FCC vote: further consolidating of the media must be halted and, better yet, reversed. TV and radio news is already in the hands of just a few profit-driven corporations and this has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide FULL AND UNBIASED information to we citizens, who supposedly own the airwaves, about public issues, especially the drive to war in Iraq. As Americans concerned about our democracy, we call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. After all, if we do own the airwaves, aren't we entitled to ALL the news and not just the news certain corporations want us to have?

Sincerely,
Lila and Irv Berman
1218 9th St
Santa Monica, CA 90401

MSN 8 helps eliminate e-mail viruses. Get 2 months FREE*.

<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: dfelt71@yahoo.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:43 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

Thank you for your attention. I am forwarding this pre-prepared e-mail in hopes that it will influence the FCC to resist the push from big business to monopolize media production in local markets. I am an independent media producer and I want to see my government's organization used for the protection of media diversity and the support of local independent production potential. I do not want to see the conglomerates have their way eased for buying up local producers. I do not want to see laws changed to accomodate the further growth of already huge companies which dominate the available mass media.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a

meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

DAVID FELTON
106 E. MARKHAM AVE APT B
DURHAM, North Carolina 27701

From: Dave Cohen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:44 AM
Subject: Media Deregulation

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media must be halted and in fact reversed. Mass media in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. These companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

David Cohen

--